FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 06/07/2019 05:11 PM INDEX NO. 652933/2012

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

# **EXHIBIT C**

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

25

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

1

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 1 COUNTY OF NEW YORK: 2 -----x ALTERRA AMERICA INSURANCE CO., 3 Index: 652813/12E 4 Plaintiff, -against-5 NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, et al. 6 Defendant. 7 DISCOVER PROPERTY & CASUALTY COMPANY, et al., 8 Plaintiff, Index: 9 -against-652933/12 10 NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, et al., 11 60 Centre Street New York, New York 10007 12 April 29, 2019 13 BEFORE: HONORABLE ANDREA MASLEY, Justice 14 15 16 APPEARANCES: 17 KENNEDYS CMK Attorneys for TIG, US Fire, North River 18 570 Lexington Avenue, 8th Floor 19 New York, New York 10022 BY: CHRISTOPHER R. CARROLL, ESQ. 20 HEATHER SIMPSON, ESQ. 21 22 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP. Attorneys for NFL, NFL Properties One City Center 23 850 Tenth Street Washington, D.C. 20001 24 BY: MITCHELL F. DOLIN, ESQ.

- Proceedings Continue Next Page -

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

APPEARANCES: PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP. Attorneys for the Nonparties Eleven Times Square New York, New York 10036 BY: SETH SCHAFLER, ESQ. STEVEN H. HOLINSTAT, ESQ. CLYDE & CO. US LLP. Attorneys for Chubb 200 Campus Drive, Suite 300 Florham Park, New Jersey 07932 BY: SHANE THOMAS CALENDAR, ESQ. Tal R. Hahn, Senior Court Reporter

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

3

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. 1 2 In the matter of Alterra America Insurance against the NFL. 3 4 Who do we have at the table? For the 5 plaintiff? 6 MR. SCHAFLER: Well, the nonparty. We are 7 the nonparty --THE COURT: For the movant. 8 9 MR. SCHAFLER: Seth Schafler, Proskauer Rose. And my colleague, Steven Holinstat, from Proskauer 10 11 also. 12 THE COURT: Okay. And -- yes? 13 MR. DOLIN: Mitchell Dolin for the NFL and 14 NFL Properties, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. CARROLL: Good morning, your Honor. 17 Chris Carroll for TIG Insurance Company, United States 18 Fire Insurance Company and North River. And 19 extensively, your Honor, I am liaison counsel for the 20 insurer. So I will speak on behalf of the insurers. 21 MR. SIMPSON: Heather Simpson, your Honor, 22 also on behalf of the insurers. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So why don't we start with 24 the movant. I looked through your papers briefly. But 25 Mr. Schafler, why don't you get started?

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

4

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

MR. SCHAFLER: Thank you, your Honor. Schafler representing the thirty-two nonparty NFL And we are here today asking this Court to issue an Order to Show Cause why the insurers should not be directed to withdraw or stay other proceedings that they commenced, at this point, in twelve other states against eighteen of the clubs which will ultimately would balloon to thirty-two clubs in twentytwo different states around the country; directing the insurers not to commence any other proceedings; consolidating all the proceedings related to these subpoenas which are virtually identical among all the clubs, including two that are in New York, and that are pending in front of Judge Dolinger at this point, into a single proceeding --

THE COURT: And you are asking that the -- I think it was an Order that Judge Dolinger issued in mediation for a special referee for the discovery -- you are asking that those -- those same parameters apply to the nonparties, is that right?

MR. SCHAFLER: Well, to the extent that there was overlap in those rulings, which we do think, and obviously those rulings are on appeal to this Court and will be heard ultimately by this Court, but our concern is that to the extent that there is overlap, and we

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

think there is, with respect to issues such as privilege, and the scope of some of the requests which are extremely extensive, yes, we do think those should apply. Plus those same rulings will apply with respect to whatever the referee decides on the Bills and Giants, who are in New York, and those same subpoenas will be in New York.

Our position is, your Honor, that it makes no sense for all of these actions to be submitted to courts around the country that do not have the knowledge that this Court has of the nature of these proceedings, the issues involved in these proceedings that could give rise to inconsistent adjudications of such issues as privilege, sensitive player information. We are talking about discovery against nonparties going back for sixty years on anything having to do with head injury. It's very difficult and very complex.

And we have offered in order to avoid having to be here today, we offered before making this motion to consolidate everything in New York. We even agreed that New York law should apply to all of the discovery issues with the exception of any state laws that may apply to things like personal protected information related to players, which there are some individual state statutes that we might have to pay attention to,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

#### Proceedings

but we have said we are prepared not only to do that, but to agree on a schedule.

We have to meet-and-confer on custodians, on search terms, before we do these searches because these clubs, it's not really fair as nonparties to be asking them to go through these searches multiple times. And we just don't see why it makes any sense at all --

THE COURT: Why is it multiple times?

MR. SCHAFLER: Well, if we don't agree on search terms, for example, and then we have to submit it and then do the same search again -- all we said is let's decide what the search terms are, let's decide on who the custodians are and we will do the productions. And if we have disagreements on the scope of anything, we will submit them to the New York Court and we will agree to be bound by the outcome.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHAFLER: Seems like an entirely rational way to proceed.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much. And Mr. Carroll, Ms. Simpson, who is up?

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, your Honor. As I understand, this is just the TRO aspect, not the actual preliminary restraints aspect of the motion. But, in any event, it's the same argument.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

They will have the ability to argue and assert any privilege position that they want to under the appropriate subpoena in the appropriate state.

And, remember, they are not just one party here. They grouped them under one counsel but we have thirty-two different nonparties --

THE COURT: I get the picture with all the people in the courtroom at the moment who I am sure are the attorneys for the others.

MR. CARROLL: Well, actually, this is just the NFL's insurers.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: But they have thirty-two different parties that Proskauer represents in twenty-two different states. And if we just go back to how this all started, your Honor, you recall at some point in time there was a series of motions that we had filed before your Honor for commissions. And your Honor ultimately granted them. The reason we needed to file those motions for commissions because the NFL wouldn't consent to us working together to figure out a way to serve the subpoenas on the teams.

So we went about the process of getting commissions through your Honor and then serving thirty-two different teams in twenty-two different

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

states. That's the process we had to go through. And we spent the last year -- these are subpoenas that were served, some of them eighteen months ago, the latest was eight months ago. Last year we tried to get documents from the teams represented by Proskauer.

We've got virtually nothing in a year and a half. We don't file motions lightly. We don't want to, but we had to.

Proskauer say it's going to be irreparable harm for the Cleveland Browns to respond to a subpoena served in Cleveland, a proper subpoena under Cleveland, or, Ohio law on them under Ohio law, that that's is irreparable harm, is absurd. This is discovery. They are not a party. We just want their documents. They could assert whatever privilege they want to assert. That they think they somehow get the benefit of a discovery dispute that was argued here between two parties that are an entirely different context under New York law --

THE COURT: It's not entirely different though.

MR. CARROLL: But it is, your Honor. We argued privilege between us and the NFL and at issue -- the at issue privilege, all issues that we had before you on June 14th because we raised these issues again

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

as part of an appeal of Judge Dolinger's ruling.

So those have nothing to do with the teams simply needing to respond to a subpoena that was properly served in a jurisdiction that they said.

And if I could, your Honor --

THE COURT: Are you punishing the teams though for the NFL's -- the position that the NFL has taken with regard to the discovery?

MR. CARROLL: Not at all, your Honor. In fact, Judge Dolinger said he expects that there will be third-party discovery that will hopefully -- that was all part of the discussion we had with Judge Dolinger.

THE COURT: No, I am not saying that it won't yield anything, but if I understand -- and I did just look at this quickly because you just walked in, but -- and just for the record it's 9:51.

It seems, if I understand the nonparties'
position correctly, they want to be within this
jurisdiction and do everything in one place which seems
efficient. So I am not sure what your objection is.
Why not just take care of everything here?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  CARROLL: Because we had to -- we already have been put through the process of serving --

THE COURT: Right. So that is the point.

Now you are punishing them because the NFL wouldn't

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

1 agree.

MR. CARROLL: It's not a punishment issue, your Honor; it's an entitlement issue. We filed a proper subpoena in another jurisdiction. What they are asking your Honor to do is arrest from that jurisdiction control of that subpoena. Under that rationale, in every case that your Honor has, every subpoena in every other jurisdiction should fall back onto this Court. And that certainly -- there is no case law in New York that suggests that.

THE COURT: But we are doing it on consent.

That is the difference. I am not taking anything from anyone. They are asking to come into this action --

MR. CARROLL: This is eighteen months later. Because they understand how slow the process has been for us, this is seven years into the case, your Honor, and we got virtually no discovery. They understand what will happen. It's simply to delay things.

By the way, the proposal that they suggested, was a staggered proposal of do this, do that. It will be four or five months down the road. If I could just read one passage, your Honor, and it's in the brief.

And I apologize for submitting the brief so late.

THE COURT: So late? It's 20 to --

MR. CARROLL: I know. I understand. It was

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

served on Friday. So we have worked over the weekend to get the opposition documents to your Honor. If I can just read --

THE COURT: Oh, that is the letter you just handed me?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, your Honor. And obviously we could refile that as a pleading, but --

THE COURT: Not at a pleading.

MR. CARROLL: As a response.

THE COURT: In the form of a Memo of Law.

MR. CARROLL: We got a lot of insurers that we have to coordinate with which we did over the weekend.

But, if I could, your Honor, this is from the teams. And this is in October 2018. And this is a quote. "It's important to note that the thirty-two nonmember teams reside in twenty-two different states, each with their own discovery rules and laws. Nonparty discovery varies widely and the nonparty clubs tend to take full advantage of those laws in the event they are subject to motion practice." That is them saying that seven months ago. Basically, you will have to deal with this state by state. And we have. And we are dealing with it state by state. And, your Honor, from our perspective, I got hearing dates set in certain

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

jurisdictions. We are moving quickly. And that's what we need. We have discovery deadlines before your Honor that are not being met. And so I have a client who is saying to me, Chris, we need these documents. So we are doing this in the fastest possible way because we think that's the best way to proceed and will get us the documents sooner, quicker, faster so we could be before your Honor prepared to adjudicate this case.

If we have anymore delays, and you will hear about this on June 14. This is a process of delay, delay, delay. We need to proceed. We have dates scheduled in these different jurisdictions. And, again, your Honor, there is no case that they could cite to your Honor where a New York court said to another state I am taking the case, I am taking that subpoena from you and I will deal with it here. Especially when there is --

THE COURT: The parties wouldn't -- the parties could agree to it.

MR. CARROLL: The parties could agree to anything they wanted to, I suspect. But my entitlement is to proceed on those subpoenas in due course because that's the way we want to; that's the process we believe will be in the best interests of our client. And just because they say we want something entirely

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

different now, it doesn't make it -- forget the fact that it doesn't make it irreparable harm, it doesn't make it proper process. This is discovery. They are not parties. All they are being asked to do is produce documents. That's it. Raise the privilege you want to raise, deal with the subpoena, that's all.

This is not an irreparable harm issue. It's what we feel is in the best interests of our client after eighteen months --

THE COURT: I heard the eighteen months. You could have a seat. Thank you so much.

MR. DOLIN: Your Honor, may I speak briefly for the NFL and NFL Properties? Mitchell Dolin. I just want to make a few points.

It's not my motion. But we are supportive of the motion. We think it makes sense to consolidate everything. And your Honor asked one of the counsel a question about the referral order. And I think the motion seeks to refer these matters to your Honor for your Honor to decide whether then to refer them on to the --

THE COURT: No, I understand that. My understanding from my quick reading of this is they want to basically tag along with whatever Dolinger already ordered. I think it was an eighty page --

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

MR. DOLIN: Right. The --

THE COURT: Can you stop for one second?

It's not in the papers I have today, but did anyone send me the Dolinger Decision? Or can you send it to me?

MR. DOLIN: It was lodged -- the date is referred to in your papers.

MR. HOLINSTAT: It's docket number 509.

THE COURT: In my docket? Oh, okay.

MR. DOLIN: Well, there are two dockets.

MR. HOLINSTAT: I believe in the 8/13. The top number.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DOLIN: In any event, your Honor, the two motions that involve New York clubs, the Bills and the Giants, the insurers filed those motions to compel and lodged them directly with Special Referee Dolinger. I think -- we think it's the Court's judgment of whether these motions and the other motions that your Honor grants the relief of applicants, whether they go to your Honor or get referred to Special Referee Dolinger.

Our view is the party is the -- the NFL, we think it makes sense to consolidate it in the courts. Some of the relief sought in these motions does implicate the NFL and there are thirty-six separate

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

requests in most of these subpoenas, all but one of which is prefaced by the word "all." These are not the sorts of discovery requests that yield orders to compel in toto which is what the insurers are seeking.

I will quote one of them to your Honor that implicates the NFL rather directly. "All documents and communications between the Bills and the NFL regarding strategy for the defense of the MDL action", that on its face implicates privilege. The NFL, as your Honor knows, is a membership association of the thirty-two clubs. The NFL has the ability to communicate with its clubs in a manner that preserves the privilege. As Mr. Carroll mentioned, the privilege -- there is a privilege matter decided on the motion by Special Referee Dolinger as a result of the appeal by the insurers will be before this Court in June.

For all of the reasons that Proskauer mentioned; process, efficiency, this Court's expertise, we submit that it's appropriate to consolidate.

Thank you.

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, may I be just heard briefly on Mr. Dolin's point? They seek to reference this privilege issue. But every single one of the motions we filed to date has what proposed order that only seeks to compel them to produce non-privileged

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

documents. We just want them to produce what they feel is not privileged. If there is a fight that remains after that, we could deal with that. We had extensive meet-and-confer efforts with them over the last many months. I will not reference the amount, as your Honor knows.

And we sought to do these exact things that they are asking now; search terms, custodians. We sought to do that many months ago. And it wasn't until we filed these motions that they came back to us with this proposal. There is no irreparable harm. Produce the documents. You are sophisticated corporations. You have documents. You have sophisticated counsel that could help you through that process. That's what we want.

We are not asking for anything that -- if they believe it's not produceable, they won't produce it. And out of thirty-two teams we've only gotten documents from fourteen and it was a handful of insurance-related documents.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it. Anyone else?

MR. SCHAFLER: May I respond briefly, your

Honor? I don't want to get too much back into history,
but the idea that the insurance companies met and

conferred with us in good faith and we didn't do

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

anything is simply not true.

We were never able to get to a place where we were able to get any compromise by the insurance companies on anything. All they ever said was we will start with this and then we reserve our right to get everything else. And when we didn't hear from the insurance companies after we kind of got to the end of our fruitless meet-and-confer process and they said, you know, we are going to do something if you don't produce documents. They went into hiding for a period of close to six months.

In the meantime, Judge Dolinger issued his rulings which addressed many issues that we think are very relevant to what the clubs are going to be required to produce. And we assumed that what was happening was that they were going to meet-and-confer with us on what Judge Dolinger had to say or what this Court would have to say. And we, as nonparties, would be able to conform what our discovery would be in light of those rulings.

Instead, what happened was that the insurance companies went out and filed all of these motions without so much as a phone call that any of this was happening, without any mention of what Judge Dolinger had done with his eighty-one page decision. We think

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

1 that that was wrong.

And in terms of the efficiency, first of all it's the insurance companies that chose this forum.

It's kind of odd for them to try to get away from it and go to some other place to get rulings on discovery but --

THE COURT: Here is the thing.

MR. SCHAFLER: Yes.

THE COURT: I can't help but feel that you are asking me to force them to agree to what is a perfectly legitimate request. And perfectly reasonable. And, yes, they did select this forum, but I can't force them to agree to something.

MR. SCHAFLER: Well, your Honor, first of all, let me just react to the idea that they are trying to present this as us trying to restrain proceedings in other states. That is not what we are trying to do.

The CPLR 3103-a is the provision that we are acting under. It is a procedure that allows the Court on the motion of any party, and we are certainly a party and I think --

THE COURT: Well, you can't be a party and a nonparty.

MR. SCHAFLER: Any person, I should say, your Honor. I misspoke. 3101-a says that any person,

1.3

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

whether any party or nonparty come into this court and on a showing that the discovery is unreasonable, annoyance, expense, embarrassment, disadvantage or other prejudice to any person or party, but it doesn't have to be a party, that we could come to this court and say, your Honor, this makes no sense.

And, really, that's what we are doing here.

We are saying to this Court you have jurisdiction over the parties. We are not restraining other courts from doing anything. We are asking you to order these parties that are before this Court that have chosen this Court to adjudicate their dispute, to adjudicate their rights with respect to discovery of nonparties in this action by this Court. Usually the cases go the other way --

THE COURT: Shouldn't you be having this conversation with the NFL?

MR. SCHAFLER: Shouldn't -- sorry?

THE COURT: Shouldn't you have this conversation with the NFL?

MR. SCHAFLER: Shouldn't we be?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCHAFLER: I don't understand why --

THE COURT: Because they're the other party in this action and they are the ones that could agree

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

to this with plaintiff. Or plaintiffs. Right? They are the parties.

MR. SCHAFLER: Well, I think they do agree that this should all be consolidated in this Court. I am not sure what you mean when you say they could agree with the insurance company. The insurance companies are no more going to agree on this with the NFL and agree -- I think what the insurance companies are doing is basically trying to use these proceedings in other states as a way to get around whatever the reasonable restrictions and rulings that this Court will make, or has made on the scope of discovery in this action.

They are looking at that as a way to get around this Court's management of the case. And the idea that that's more efficient, that they will get rulings faster in some other state, what is going to end up happening, they will have appeal processes in thirty-two -- against thirty-two clubs in eighteen different states, with inconsistent rulings, all the over the place about the exact same documents.

So, you know, we are coming in here and saying this is what we want. Usually the laws are designed to protect the interests of the nonparties. Right? They are designed to say we shouldn't be required to be dragged in here.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

The Kansas City Chiefs shouldn't have to adjudicate their rulings in New York. They should be able to do that in Kansas City. That's their home court. We are saying no, we are happy to do that, we want to do that, and ready to do that. And the insurance companies are saying no. It's -- there is no reason for it. There is no rational reason for it other than purely to impose costs.

Your Honor said punishment. That is exactly what they are trying to do. And they pose it as if they are trying to be reasonable, but in reality what they are doing is trying to create confusion, cost, inconsistent adjudications, all across the country with respect to the same documents.

So 3103, your Honor, is what our authority is. We think the Court has the authority to do that. We think there's been sufficient showing at least at this stage of irreparable harm. We are asking this Court to enter into an Order until it could be heard on merits to stop this from going forward. They went out and they got an Order in Indiana that we didn't even have an opportunity to respond to, to force us to produce everything within thirty days. We didn't even have an opportunity to respond. That is what is going to happen here. The courts that know nothing about

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

22

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

this case and --1 2 THE COURT: Hold on. What? MR. SCHAFLER: They got an Order out of a 3 4 court in Indiana --THE COURT: Oh, the commission. 5 6 MR. SCHAFLER: They took it to Indiana. 7 Indiana Court on the same day that the motion was filed granted the Order without giving us any opportunity to 8 9 respond at all. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. SCHAFLER: At all. THE COURT: And there is no Due Process in 12 1.3 Indiana? 14 MR. SCHAFLER: This is the problem. These 15 courts do not have the underlying action. They don't 16 know what the issues are. They are just saying, oh, 17 some discovery issue, we will just grant the motion. 18 THE COURT: And are you saying that --19 MR. SCHAFLER: It should be decided by this 20 Court. 21 THE COURT: Isn't that the process that they 22 followed for commissions? Are you saying that they are 23 treating you in a special way? MR. SCHAFLER: No, that's the procedure they 24 25 follow for commissions.

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

THE COURT: And it's your job to file a motion and object to that.

MR. SCHAFLER: We are doing that. We are doing more than that. We are saying it should consolidated because it effects your Honor's control over this litigation. Your Honor has this litigation before you. Your Honor has appointed a Referee to decide on the discovery issues with the intention that that Referee will develop the knowledge and expertise to determine how to adjudicate the relevant discovery issues in this case. This should be part of it. It's going to be part of it.

The Giants and Bills are already part of it.

There is no way that Judge Dolinger is not going to rule on this. It makes no sense to ask some other court to rule who knows nothing about this case, to adjudicate the entire issue which that court doesn't know anything about --

THE COURT: Let -- can you stop for one second? Have a seat. Just have a seat.

If I were to adjudicate the issues with the Giants and Bills immediately, and the other nonparty teams agreed to go along with whatever the rulings are in those cases, is that something that you could stand down in the other states while we do this if I say that

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

we will do that part of it expeditiously? You see what I am saying?

MR. CARROLL: I do understand what your Honor is saying. Again, from our perspective we chose a litigation route that we think is within our client's best interests.

THE COURT: You just said before it was imposed upon you by the NFL because they wouldn't agree to discovery. You either chose it or it --

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, but that is to give context as to why we are here. That is not to say we wouldn't have done it anyway. We would have gone through an easier process and negotiated and went through things differently.

In any event, to answer your Honor's questions, that doesn't. Because the Cleveland Browns are governed under a subpoena by Ohio law. And I don't know what the law will be. It could be to my detriment. In any event, we are proceeding faster there and we want to proceed. We could voluntarily do a whole bunch of things. We don't think we have to do that.

THE COURT: So where are we with the subpoenas with the Giants and the Bills? Where are we?

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, we submitted those

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

## Proceedings

to Judge Dolinger on April 5th. And he initially set a
oriefing schedule and counsel for the Bills and Giants
asked for more time and I don't believe that has been
their request for more some time has not been
completed so there is no schedule for briefing on that
right now.

THE COURT: And what was the original proposal?

MR. SIMPSON: On the briefing?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SIMPSON: He had asked for opposition by April 26th, and I think replies by the 29th. Or -- around that. It was a short time frame.

MR. SCHAFLER: Your Honor, we would be prepared to agree to something along the lines of what your Honor suggested. We think that if they want to fast track the determinations with respect to the Bills and Giants, and --

THE COURT: Well, it sounds like Dolinger did that already.

MR. CARROLL: Well, it hasn't been agreed to yet. They haven't agreed to dates yet. Judge Dolinger proposed dates.

THE COURT: The April 26th and April 29th dates.

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

MR. CARROLL: Right.

THE COURT: And you didn't put in your op yet with the -- for the Bills and Giants?

MR. SCHAFLER: No, not yet. We wanted to meet-and-confer with the insurance companies initially to see if they would agree to consolidation. We wanted to bring everything from Judge Dolinger and brief it all at the same time, and so we came up with this proposal --

THE COURT: As I understand, and I did look at your papers quickly, but aren't you saying that the subpoenas are similar?

MR. SCHAFLER: Virtually identical.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHAFLER: The only differences between them, if one particular team had a particular player that had a head injury that they know about, they might want to ask something about that player. Other than that, they are boilerplate, every single one is the same. So the issues will be the same.

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, if I could, your Honor raised an issue with counsel before about what the legal authority of this Court is to do what he is asking you to do. And you -- and referred to 3103-a and -- 3103-a refers to burden and harassment and all

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

the typical things that --

THE COURT: I don't think I have burden and harassment in here. But I do have -- I do have, you know, a large unwieldy case that I'd like to find a way to organize it.

MR. CARROLL: I understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: But that is all on consent.

It's not -- I don't think you have what you need to get a TRO. That is for sure. But we should be able to work something out.

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, I presume your Honor will set a briefing schedule on the preliminary injunction aspect of it. We could continue to confer in the interim, and we will. And if something works out, obviously we will report back to your Honor. But from a TRO perspective, we just don't see it.

THE COURT: Right. What if the nonparty teams were to produce the documents to which they have no objection?

MR. CARROLL: That would be a fantastic start to a process that might be something that we could then work out, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can't help but feel that -that you are using this iss ue to bring all the teams
before Dolinger. Why not just produce the documents

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

which you don't object to? Why not do that now?

MR. SCHAFLER: We want to do that.

THE COURT: They will take them.

MR. SCHAFLER: We have to have an agreement on what the search terms are and who the custodians are. And they refused to agree to that. That was part of our proposal. We said we will by May 10th -- we gave them a specific date. We said by May 10 on every one of these thirty-two we will give you the custodians and accept the search terms that Judge Dolinger agreed to in his eighty-one page ruling, and if there is anything, you know, other than that that is specific to the clubs, we will talk to you about that.

Honor, and I do this with some trepidation because your Honor has already said that you don't think you have sufficient annoyance, burden, prejudice, et cetera, and I -- with all due respect I really do think that you do. And if you look at the cases, particularly the Federal cases that talk about this because it happens all the time, the possibility of subjecting parties to inconsistent adjudications and discovery obligations, especially when they are nonparties is the poster child of what this type of motion is about, and what this statute is intended to do.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

And especially when you have a party that's saying we are prepared to bring it into this court, and to abide by the rulings of this court, what possible reason could there be other than to impose unreasonable time frames, obligations, try to get an advantage from other courts that are not familiar with these issues? What other possible reason could there be besides the very type of vexatious conduct that this statute is intended to protect against?

So, with respect, your Honor, and I am not trying to argue with you lightly, but I feel that -- you are correct in being concerned about your jurisdiction here and the power to do this and whether these are circumstances that warrant it, but I would say that, yes, you do have this --

THE COURT: This is a -- isn't the risk of inconsistent decisions coming from, you know, if they ask for a particular football player's records or -- I see someone shake his head no, no, no. You want to stand up and tell me what your argument is, that would be a lot better than shaking your head no, no, no.

MR. HOLINSTAT: Your Honor, if the Jets on the one hand have documents that they shared with the Bills, especially privileged documents --

THE COURT: They are not asking for

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

1 privileged documents though.

MR. HOLINSTAT: The difference is -- there is a difference as to what they are. They are asking for any and all documents shared among the teams. So if you have documents in one jurisdiction, and New Jersey said to the Jets, you don't have to produce any of these documents, your Jets documents that you have, they are not relevant and you don't have to produce them. Then they go to Missouri and say, well, your -- THE COURT: I understand what inconsistent

means.

Thank you. Have a seat. Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, and I will be brief. They still will be represented by the same counsel taking the same position. There will certainly be symmetry in terms of what they want to do.

If I could just briefly on the Federal case law, all the Federal jurisdictions are governed by the Federal Civil Procedure. 45(f) allows the Court to do exactly what they are asking the Court to do here.

The problem here is, New York is different than California, Ohio, Florida. If the teams would simply produce -- we are okay with the search terms. We were okay with the search terms. Let them produce the documents that they have. If we feel it's

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

appropriate, we will work something out, your Honor. I am not interested in litigating all around the world if we don't have to. I want a faster, cheaper, better way to get there. We think this is the way to do it. We think that is what got them here and hopefully will then motivate them. But if your Honor just tells them to produce the documents and then we could figure out if we need to continue with the briefing and come back before your Honor. That would go a long way, we think, in getting us what we need.

THE COURT: What I would need from you to get to that point is that you would stand down for thirty days while they do that. If I understand you correctly. You will do the search. You will produce the documents to which you don't agree. Right?

MR. SCHAFLER: Yes, your Honor. By the way, we did ask them for an across the board thirty day tolling period or what have you. And they didn't previously --

THE COURT: You know what, here is the thing; we are here now. I don't care what you offered before.

MR. SCHAFLER: Okay. Yes.

THE COURT: Right now I have all of you here. So that is nice and thank you very much. And, oh, where is the little sign on the table about being good

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

### Proceedings

to each other and respectful? So I appreciate that.

And it means a lot to me in all of my three hundred

fifty cases that the parties treat each other this way.

But here we are.

So, if the plaintiffs would agree to -- these are the search terms that you have proposed to the nonparties? They have that?

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, we did propose search terms six months ago and we didn't make any progress with them. I get it, we are not talking about the past. But I just want to add that Mr. Schafler has more recently proposed using the search terms from Judge Dolinger's opinion. The majority of those are applicable here, but because the teams have specific players we believe there would be a few more team specific that would have to be added.

THE COURT: So what about agreeing to the general -- step one; general. We will do the specific players separately, or you could make up a list, a supplemental list of particular players. But for now they do a search using Dolinger's terms.

MS. SIMPSON: I think that would be a great first step. I think one thing we would also need to clarify with them is location of searches. Obviously our subpoenas go well beyond ESIs and e-mails and

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

things like that. If they have hard copy files, if they have old databases, we would need to work around the parameters. I think that it would be a very good step.

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, if we could do that and get them to produce their documents in the next thirty days, I would be prepared to recommend to my colleagues that we stand down for thirty days.

MR. SCHAFLER: Better than where we are right now, your Honor. We will be happy to proceed on that basis.

THE COURT: So you would begin with the Dolinger terms and produce the documents immediately, to which there are no objections. And then plaintiffs will provide you with a list of specific per team, right? Regarding specific players.

They are not seeking -- just to be clear, you are not seeking privilege HIPA --

MR. CARROLL: That's correct.

THE COURT: -- issues. So that is --

MR. SCHAFLER: That was not clear to me before but I am happy to hear that.

MR. CARROLL: With the understanding, your Honor, that if need be, we could then come back to your Honor in thirty days and revisit where we are?

33

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

34

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

	Proceedings
1	THE COURT: The privilege and the HIPA?
2	MR. CARROLL: No. No. The production and
3	where we are in connection with the rest of whether we
4	will have to do something else on the Order to Show
5	Cause. If, for example, they produce five documents we
6	will have issues and concerns and problems. We will
7	need to address whether we are going to proceed in
8	other jurisdictions. We are standing down for now but
9	not giving up the right to proceed in those other
10	jurisdictions. If we feel we need to, and if your
11	Honor ultimately rejects the Order to Show Cause. But
12	that's a fight for a different day.
13	THE COURT: Well, I wouldn't be able to
14	determine that anyway.
15	MR. CARROLL: Understood.
16	THE COURT: Until I get arguments from both
17	sides and give you an opportunity to reply to their
18	papers anyway. If we could avoid all of that, that
19	would be much better.
20	MR. CARROLL: Understood, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about dates.
22	So you basically put together your
23	opposition, right?
24	MR. CARROLL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So we are only talking about a

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

> 35 Proceedings 1 reply? 2 MR. CARROLL: That is just on the TRO. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So you want to put in an 4 op, right? 5 MR. CARROLL: On the Order to Show Cause 6 aspect of it? 7 THE COURT: The preliminary injunction which shouldn't be that different from the TRO. 8 9 MR. CARROLL: Within ten days please. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Sure. Then how much time 11 do you want for a reply? That gives you -- that gets 12 you to May 13. 13 MR. SCHAFLER: Seven days, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: So that gets you to the 20th. 15 So you could have May 23rd at 3:00 for 16 argument. 17 MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, could I suggest if 18 we could have the next available date after May 29 --19 THE COURT: Yes. And you have June 13th, 20 right? 21 MR. SIMPSON: June 14th. 22 MR. HOLINSTAT: 14th. MR. CARROLL: We are actually arguing the 23 24 appeals from Judge Dolinger's rulings.

> > THE COURT: Maybe we should just save this.

25

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

36

Proceedings

MR. CARROLL: That would be great. If we 1 2 could have a date by which to produce their documents. And we are fine with June 13th. 3 4 MR. DOLIN: Sorry. 14th, right? MR. CARROLL: June 14th. Sorry. 5 6 THE COURT: I have 11:30 to 1:00. Okay. 7 let's work back from there. 8 MR. DOLIN: Your Honor, on the preliminary 9 injunction motion, may the NFL file the supporting 10 papers on the same schedule --11 THE COURT: Sure. 12 MR. DOLIN: Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: So May 17 for the op and May 31 14 for the reply. 15 (Brief pause.) 16 THE COURT: May 31st for the op and June 7th 17 for the reply. So you have the Dolinger's Decision with the search terms, right? 18 19 MR. SCHAFLER: Yes. 20 THE COURT: So how long will it take you to 21 work with the other teams to make your first search? 22 MR. SCHAFLER: Well, we'll start working on 23 that right away, your Honor. Each team is a little 24 different in terms of their capabilities, their

electronic make-up and such. So we will, you know,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

# Proceedings

1	make	maximal	efforts	with	every	one	of	these	thirty-two
2	teams	5.							

THE COURT: So May 13th you could do that?

MR. SCHAFLER: To begin production?

THE COURT: To make the production consistent with the Dolinger terms.

MR. HOLINSTAT: Your Honor, we will certainly get the custodian to run the searches. In terms of how the documents could be done, we would offer rolling production. If it's ten million documents versus five thousand, it just depends on how many documents there are. We offered this before to do this on a rolling basis --

THE COURT: See, the problem I have with a rolling basis is if you would just produce the documents to which there is no objection, the rolling basis meaning you have to review the ten thousand or --

MR. HOLINSTAT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you will roll it as you review them?

MR. HOLINSTAT: Yes, your Honor. And the idea is we have to search for privilege anyway to take it out and we would continue to produce them as they come out.

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, to make it easy,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

can I suggest they produce everything by June 1st as opposed to rolling basis? That will give us two weeks to evaluate it --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. CARROLL: I would love it sooner but I want to be practical. Your Honor says please treat your adversary with dignity and respect. So we want to do that. We are not here to make things difficult. So if that helps.

THE COURT: And just to be clear, you are agreeing to the jurisdiction of this Court for the purposes of this discovery matter? All these subpoenas; is that correct?

MR. SCHAFLER: That is correct, your Honor.

Of course we would be doing that on the basis that they were not going to be proceeding simultaneously in all these other jurisdictions --

THE COURT: They are agreeing to it and based on your consent I will sign the TRO --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  CARROLL: We were agreeing to stand down for the time period --

THE COURT: Until June --

MR. CARROLL: Well, until we argue before your Honor if we have to argue before your Honor.

THE COURT: So between now and June 14th

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

Proceedings

there is a stay on proceeding to the extent I could control the one party before me. So there will be that stay on consent. But your part of this is to produce the documents, and to agree to the Court's jurisdiction, even though those nonparties are not before this Court.

MR. SCHAFLER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I think I would want something from them agreeing to that.

MR. SCHAFLER: We have said that in our papers, but if you need something from me --

THE COURT: I understand you said it.

MR. SCHAFLER: I represent him. I said it.

THE COURT: I think I need something where they agree to the Court's jurisdiction.

MR. SCHAFLER: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: And, your Honor, I think technically, we will do what your Honor feels appropriate, but I don't think granting the TRO is right because there is no verbal irreparable harm. I think a consent to the stay is what the appropriate process is here.

THE COURT: Right. I am not granting it based upon the statute. I am granting it based upon your consent.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

25

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

40

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

# Proceedings

	Proceedings
1	MR. CARROLL: Fair enough. Appreciate it.
2	THE COURT: I will make that clear in the
3	TRO.
4	MR. CALENDAR: Your Honor, Shane Calendar for
5	Chubb. One thing. For the reply on June 7th, to the
6	extent that the NFL is going to be filing papers, the
7	insurers also have a chance to respond to the papers on
8	the June 7th
9	MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, could we just run
10	through those dates once more? I wrote down May 17th
11	for the op and May 31st for the reply
12	THE COURT: No, no. I changed it. May 31st
13	for the op. And June 7th for the reply. I changed it.
14	MR. DOLIN: Your Honor NFL has responded
15	which is why we asked for the same dates as the
16	insurers. We are happy to file our response seven days
17	in advance from when the insurers have to respond. So
18	if Mr. Calendar wants to say something
19	THE COURT: So you will use the May 31st
20	date?
21	MR. DOLIN: No, I was saying I will do it
22	seven days earlier, so if the insurers want to say
23	something about our paper
24	THE COURT: May 31st.

MR. CARROLL: May 24th?

25

it.

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

41

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings

MR. DOLIN: I was offering May 24. 1 2 THE COURT: Oh. So they get my -- the NFL's seven 3 MR. DOLIN: 4 days before the --5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. DOLIN: And they will know what I said. 7 THE COURT: I understand. Thank you. Anything else? 8 9 MR. SCHAFLER: No, your Honor. Thank you. MR. HOLINSTAT: Thank you. 10 11 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So to be clear, you will 13 get me something from the nonparties, simple 14 stipulation. MR. SCHAFLER: Yes. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. I will reference this 17 transcript in the Order that I am signing. And just 18 because the ECF system is a little slow, I will ask 19 that one person stay so that we could give you a copy 20 of it and you could circulate it. Because there is a 21 two or three week lag for some reason with things going 22 on. MR. CARROLL: Thank you, your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: Okay. And you could circulate

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

Proceedings 42

1 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Judge.

MR. DOLIN: Thank you, your Honor.

3 \* \* \* \* \*

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic minutes taken within.

Tal R. Hahn,

Senior Court Reporter

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

				1
0	6	<b>agreed</b> [5] - 5:20, 23:23, 25:21, 25:22,	avoid [2] - 5:18, 34:18	3:16, 6:22, 7:10, 7:13, 8:22, 9:9, 9:22,
<b>07932</b> [1] - 2:9	<b>60</b> [1] - 1:11 <b>652813/12E</b> [1] - 1:3	28:10 agreeing [5] - 32:17,	В	10:2, 10:14, 10:25, 11:6, 11:9, 11:11,
1	<b>652933/12</b> [1] - 1:9	38:11, 38:18, 38:20, 39:9	<b>balloon</b> [1] - 4:8 <b>based</b> [3] - 38:18,	12:20, 24:3, 24:10, 25:21, 26:1, 26:21,
<b>10</b> [1] - 28:8 <b>10007</b> [1] - 1:11	7	agreement [1] - 28:4 al [3] - 1:5, 1:7, 1:10	39:24 <b>basis</b> [6] - 33:11,	27:6, 27:11, 27:20, 30:13, 33:5, 33:19,
<b>10022</b> [1] - 1:19	<b>7th</b> [4] - 36:16, 40:5,	allows [2] - 18:19,	37:13, 37:15, 37:17,	33:23, 34:2, 34:15,
<b>10036</b> [1] - 2:5 <b>10th</b> [1] - 28:7	40:8, 40:13	30:19 <b>Alterra</b> [1] - 3:2	38:2, 38:15 <b>begin</b> [2] - 33:12, 37:4	34:20, 34:24, 35:2, 35:5, 35:9, 35:17,
<b>11:30</b> [1] - 36:6	8	<b>ALTERRA</b> [1] - 1:2	behalf [2] - 3:20, 3:22	35:23, 36:1, 36:5, 37:25, 38:5, 38:20,
<b>13</b> [1] - 35:12 <b>13th</b> [3] - 35:19, 36:3,	8/13 [1] - 14:11	America [1] - 3:2 AMERICA [1] - 1:2	benefit [1] - 8:17 best [4] - 12:6, 12:24,	38:23, 39:17, 40:1,
37:3 <b>14</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 12:10	<b>850</b> [1] - 1:23 <b>8th</b> [1] - 1:18	amount [1] - 16:5	13:8, 24:6 better [4] - 29:21,	40:25, 41:11, 41:23, 42:1
<b>14</b> [1] - 12.10 <b>14th</b> [6] - 8:25, 35:21,		<b>ANDREA</b> [1] - 1:14 <b>annoyance</b> [2] - 19:3,	31:3, 33:9, 34:19	Carroll [3] - 3:17,
35:22, 36:4, 36:5, 38:25	9	28:17 <b>answer</b> [1] - 24:15	<b>between</b> [5] - 8:18, 8:23, 15:7, 26:15,	6:21, 15:13 <b>case</b> [12] - 10:7,
<b>17</b> [1] - 36:13	<b>9:51</b> [1] - 9:16	anyway [4] - 24:12,	38:25	10:10, 10:16, 12:8, 12:13, 12:15, 20:14,
<b>17th</b> [1] - 40:10 <b>1:00</b> [1] - 36:6	Α	34:14, 34:18, 37:22 apologize [1] - 10:23	beyond [1] - 32:25 Bills [10] - 5:5, 14:15,	22:1, 23:11, 23:16,
<b>1st</b> [1] - 38:1	<b>abide</b> [1] - 29:3	appeal [4] - 4:23, 9:1,	15:7, 23:13, 23:22, 24:24, 25:2, 25:17,	27:4, 30:17 cases [5] - 19:14,
2	<b>ability</b> [2] - 7:1, 15:11 <b>able</b> [6] - 17:2, 17:3,	15:15, 20:17 <b>appeals</b> [1] - 35:24	26:3, 29:24	23:24, 28:19, 28:20,
<b>20</b> [1] - 10:24	17:19, 21:3, 27:9,	applicable [1] - 32:14 applicants [1] - 14:20	<b>board</b> [1] - 31:17 <b>boilerplate</b> [1] - 26:19	32:3 CASUALTY [1] - 1:7
<b>200</b> [1] - 2:9	34:13 <b>absurd</b> [1] - 8:14	<b>apply</b> [5] - 4:20, 5:4,	bound [1] - 6:16	Center [1] - 1:23 Centre [1] - 1:11
<b>20001</b> [1] - 1:24 <b>2018</b> [1] - 11:15	accept [1] - 28:10	5:21, 5:23 appointed [1] - 23:7	<b>brief</b> [5] - 10:22, 10:23, 26:7, 30:14,	certain [1] - 11:25
<b>2019</b> [1] - 1:12	accurate [1] - 42:4	appointed [1] - 23:7 appreciate [2] - 32:1,	36:15	certainly [4] - 10:9,
<b>20th</b> [1] - 35:14	acting [1] - 18:19	40:1	<b>briefing</b> [5] - 25:2,	18:20, 30:15, 37:7
<b>23rd</b> [1] - 35:15	<b>action</b> [6] - 10:13, 15:8, 19:14, 19:25,	appropriate [6] - 7:3,	25:5, 25:9, 27:12, 31:8	Certified [1] - 42:4 cetera [1] - 28:17
<b>24</b> [1] - 41:1 <b>24th</b> [1] - 40:25	20:12, 22:15	15:19, 31:1, 39:19,	<b>briefly</b> [5] - 3:24,	chance [1] - 40:7
<b>26th</b> [2] - 25:12, 25:24	<b>actions</b> [1] - 5:9	39:21 <b>April</b> [5] - 1:12, 25:1,	13:12, 15:22, 16:22,	changed [2] - 40:12,
<b>29</b> [2] - 1:12, 35:18	actual [1] - 6:23	25:12, 25:24	30:17	40:13
<b>29th</b> [2] - 25:12, 25:24	add [1] - 32:11 added [1] - 32:16	<b>argue</b> [4] - 7:1, 29:11, 38:23, 38:24	<b>bring</b> [3] - 26:7, 27:24, 29:2	cheaper [1] - 31:3 Chiefs [1] - 21:1
3	address [1] - 34:7	argued [2] - 8:18, 8:23	Browns [2] - 8:11,	child [1] - 28:23
<b>300</b> [1] - 2:9	addressed [1] - 17:13 adjudicate [7] - 12:8,	arguing [1] - 35:23	24:16 <b>bunch</b> [1] - 24:21	<b>chose</b> [3] - 18:3, 24:4, 24:9
<b>31</b> [1] - 36:13	19:12, 21:2, 23:10,	<b>argument</b> [3] - 6:25, 29:20, 35:16	burden [3] - 26:25,	chosen [1] - 19:11
<b>3101-a</b> [1] - 18:25	23:17, 23:21	arguments [1] - 34:16	27:2, 28:17	Chris [2] - 3:17, 12:4
<b>3103</b> [1] - 21:15	adjudications [3] -	arrest [1] - 10:5	BURLING [1] - 1:22	CHRISTOPHER [1] -
<b>3103-a</b> [3] - 18:18,	5:13, 21:13, 28:22 advance [1] - 40:17	aspect [4] - 6:23, 6:24,	<b>BY</b> [4] - 1:19, 1:24,	1:19 Chubb to: 2:8 40:5
26:24, 26:25 <b>31st</b> [5] - 36:16, 40:11,	advantage [2] - 11:20,	27:13, 35:6	2:5, 2:10	Chubb [2] - 2:8, 40:5 circulate [2] - 41:20,
40:12, 40:19, 40:24	29:5	assert [3] - 7:2, 8:16 association [1] -	С	41:24
<b>3:00</b> [1] - 35:15	adversary [1] - 38:7 ago [5] - 8:3, 8:4,	15:10	Calendar [1] - 40:4	circumstances [1] - 29:14
4	11:22, 16:9, 32:9	assumed [1] - 17:15 attention [1] - 5:25	<b>CALENDAR</b> [2] - 2:10,	cite [1] - 12:14
<b>45(f</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 30:19	<b>agree</b> [21] - 6:2, 6:9, 6:16, 10:1, 12:19,	Attorneys [3] - 1:18,	40:4 calendar [1] - 40:18	<b>City</b> [3] - 1:23, 21:1, 21:3
	12:20, 18:10, 18:13, 19:25, 20:3, 20:5,	2:4, 2:8 attorneys [2] - 1:22,	California [1] - 30:22 Campus [1] - 2:9	Civil [1] - 30:19
5	20:7, 20:8, 24:8,	7:9 <b>authority</b> [3] - 21:15,	capabilities [1] -	<b>clarify</b> [1] - 32:24 <b>clear</b> [5] - 33:17,
<b>509</b> [1] - 14:8 <b>570</b> [1] - 1:18	25:15, 26:6, 28:6, 31:15, 32:5, 39:4,	21:16, 26:23	36:24	33:21, 38:10, 40:2,
570 [1] - 1:18 5th [1] - 25:1	39:15	available [1] - 35:18	care [2] - 9:21, 31:21 CARROLL [48] - 1:19,	41:12 Cleveland [4] - 8:11,
		<b>Avenue</b> [1] - 1:18	,	J. 0. 1 1,

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

8:12, 24:16 client [3] - 12:3, 12:24, 13:8 client's [1] - 24:5 close [1] - 17:11 clubs [12] - 4:3, 4:7, 4:8, 4:13, 6:5, 11:19, 14:15, 15:11, 15:12, 17:14, 20:18, 28:13 **CLYDE** [1] - 2:8 CMK [1] - 1:17 CO [2] - 1:2, 2:8 colleague [1] - 3:10 colleagues [1] - 33:8 coming [2] - 20:21, 29:17 commence [1] - 4:10 commenced [1] - 4:6 commission [1] - 22:5 commissions [5] -7:18, 7:20, 7:24, 22:22, 22:25 communicate [1] -15:11 communications [1] -15:7 companies [9] -16:24, 17:4, 17:7, 17:22, 18:3, 20:6, 20:8, 21:6, 26:5 **COMPANY** [1] - 1:7 company [1] - 20:6 Company [2] - 3:17, 3.18 compel [3] - 14:16, 15:3, 15:25 completed [1] - 25:5 complex [1] - 5:17 compromise [1] - 17:3 concern [1] - 4:24 **concerned** [1] - 29:12 concerns [1] - 34:6 conduct [1] - 29:8 confer [6] - 6:3, 16:4, 17:8, 17:16, 26:5, conferred [1] - 16:25 conform [1] - 17:19 confusion [1] - 21:12 connection [1] - 34:3 consent [7] - 7:21, 10:11, 27:7, 38:19, 39:3, 39:21, 39:25 consistent [1] - 37:5 consolidate [4] - 5:20, 13:16, 14:23, 15:19 consolidated [2] -20:4, 23:5 consolidating [1] -4:11

consolidation [1] -26:6 context [2] - 8:19, 24:11 Continue [1] - 1:25 continue [3] - 27:13, 31:8, 37:23 control [3] - 10:6, 23:5, 39:2 conversation [2] -19:17, 19:20 coordinate [1] - 11:12 copy [2] - 33:1, 41:19 corporations [1] -16:12 correct [4] - 29:12, 33:19, 38:13, 38:14 correctly [2] - 9:18, 31:14 cost [1] - 21:12 costs [1] - 21:8 counsel [7] - 3:19, 7:5, 13:17, 16:13, 25:2, 26:22, 30:15 country [3] - 4:9, 5:10, 21:13 COUNTY [1] - 1:1 course [2] - 12:22, 38:15 Court [26] - 2:25, 4:3, 4:23, 4:24, 5:11, 6:15, 10:9, 15:16, 17:18, 18:19, 19:8, 19:11, 19:12, 19:14, 20:4, 20:11, 21:16, 21:19, 22:7, 22:20, 26:23, 30:19, 30:20, 38:11, 39:6, 42:8 COURT [105] - 1:1, 3:1, 3:8, 3:12, 3:15, 3:23, 4:16, 6:8, 6:17, 6:20, 7:7, 7:12, 8:20, 9:6, 9:13, 9:24, 10:11, 10:24, 11:4, 11:8, 11:10, 12:18, 13:10, 13:22, 14:2, 14:9, 14:13, 16:21, 18:7, 18:9, 18:22, 19:16, 19:19, 19:22, 19:24, 22:2, 22:5, 22:10, 22:12, 22:18, 22:21, 23:1, 23:19, 24:7, 24:23, 25:7, 25:10, 25:19, 25:24, 26:2, 26:10, 26:14, 27:2, 27:7, 27:17, 27:23, 28:3, 29:16, 29:25, 30:10, 31:11, 31:20, 31:23, 32:17, 33:12, 33:20, 34:1,

34:13, 34:16, 34:21, 34:25, 35:3, 35:7, 35:10, 35:14, 35:19, 35:25, 36:6, 36:11, 36:13, 36:16, 36:20, 37:3, 37:5, 37:14, 37:19, 38:4, 38:10, 38:18. 38:22. 38:25. 39:8, 39:12, 39:14, 39:23, 40:2, 40:12, 40:19, 40:24, 41:2, 41:5, 41:7, 41:12, 41:16, 41:24 court [9] - 12:14, 19:1, 19:5, 21:4, 22:4, 23:16, 23:17, 29:2, 29.3 Court's [5] - 14:18, 15:18, 20:14, 39:4, 39.15 **courtroom** [1] - 7:8 courts [6] - 5:10, 14:23, 19:9, 21:25, 22:15, 29:6 COVINGTON [1] -**CPLR** [1] - 18:18 create [1] - 21:12 **custodian** [1] - 37:8 custodians [5] - 6:3, 6:13, 16:8, 28:5, 28:9

#### D

disagreements [1] -6:14 **D.C** [1] - 1:24 **DISCOVER** [1] - 1:7 databases [1] - 33:2 discovery [24] - 4:18, date [6] - 14:6, 15:24, 5:15. 5:21. 8:14. 28:8, 35:18, 36:2, 8:17. 9:8. 9:11. 40:20 10:17, 11:18, 11:19, dates [8] - 11:25, 12:2, 13:3, 15:3, 12:11, 25:22, 25:23, 17:19, 18:5, 19:2, 25:25, 34:21, 40:10, 19:13, 20:12, 22:17, 40:15 23:8, 23:10, 24:9, days [10] - 21:23, 28:22, 38:12 31:13, 33:7, 33:8, discussion [1] - 9:12 33:25, 35:9, 35:13, dispute [2] - 8:18, 40:16, 40:22, 41:4 19:12 deadlines [1] - 12:2 docket [2] - 14:8, 14:9 deal [4] - 11:22, 12:16, dockets [1] - 14:10 13:6, 16:3 documents [36] - 8:5, dealing [1] - 11:24 8:15, 11:2, 12:4, decide [4] - 6:12, 12:7, 13:5, 15:6, 13:20, 23:8 16:1, 16:12, 16:13, decided [2] - 15:14, 16:19, 16:20, 17:10, 22:19 20:20, 21:14, 27:18, decides [1] - 5:5 27:25, 29:23, 29:24, **Decision** [2] - 14:4, 30:1, 30:4, 30:5, 36:17 30:7, 30:25, 31:7, decision [1] - 17:25 31:15, 33:6, 33:13,

19:3

decisions [1] - 29:17 34:5, 36:2, 37:9, **Defendant** [1] - 1:6 37:10, 37:11, 37:16, defense [1] - 15:8 **Dolin** [2] - 3:13, 13:13 delay [4] - 10:18, **DOLIN** [16] - 1:24, 12:10, 12:11 3:13, 13:12, 14:1, delays [1] - 12:9 designed [2] - 20:23, 14:6, 14:10, 14:14, 36:4, 36:8, 36:12, 20.24 40:14, 40:21, 41:1, determinations [1] -41:3, 41:6, 42:2 25:17 **Dolin's** [1] - 15:22 determine [2] - 23:10, Dolinger [21] - 4:14, 34:14 4:17, 9:10, 9:12, detriment [1] - 24:19 develop [1] - 23:9 13:24, 14:4, 14:17, 14:21, 15:15, 17:12, difference [3] - 10:12, 17:17, 17:24, 23:14, 30:2. 30:3 25:1, 25:19, 25:22, differences [1] - 26:15 26:7, 27:25, 28:10, different [16] - 4:9, 33:13, 37:6 7:6, 7:14, 7:15, 7:25, **Dolinger's** [5] - 9:1, 8:19, 8:20, 11:17, 32:13, 32:21, 35:24, 12:12, 13:1, 20:19, 36:17 30:21, 34:12, 35:8, done [3] - 17:25, 36:24 24:12, 37:9 differently [1] - 24:14 down [7] - 10:21, difficult [2] - 5:17, 23:25. 31:12. 33:8. 38:8 34:8, 38:20, 40:10 dignity [1] - 38:7 dragged [1] - 20:25 directed [1] - 4:5 **Drive** [1] - 2:9 directing [1] - 4:9 Due [1] - 22:12 directly [2] - 14:17, due [2] - 12:22, 28:18 15:6 disadvantage [1] -

## E

e-mails [1] - 32:25 easier [1] - 24:13 easy [1] - 37:25 ECF [1] - 41:18 effects [1] - 23:5 efficiency [2] - 15:18, 18:2 efficient [2] - 9:20, 20:15 efforts [2] - 16:4, 37:1 eight [1] - 8:4 eighteen [6] - 4:7, 8:3, 10:14, 13:9, 13:10, 20:18 eighty [3] - 13:25, 17:25, 28:11 eighty-one [2] - 17:25, 28:11 either [1] - 24:9 electronic [1] - 36:25 Eleven [1] - 2:4 embarrassment [1] -19:3 end [2] - 17:7, 20:17 enter [1] - 21:19 entire [1] - 23:17

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

entirely [4] - 6:18, 8:19, 8:20, 12:25 entitlement [2] - 10:3, 12.21 ESIs [1] - 32:25 especially [4] - 12:17, 28:23, 29:1, 29:24 ESQ [6] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:24, 2:5, 2:6, 2:10 et [4] - 1:5, 1:7, 1:10, 28:17 evaluate [1] - 38:3 event [5] - 6:25, 11:20, 14:14, 24:15, 24:19 exact [2] - 16:7, 20:20 exactly [2] - 21:9, 30:20 example [2] - 6:10, 34:5 exception [1] - 5:22 expects [1] - 9:10 expeditiously [1] expense [1] - 19:3 expertise [2] - 15:18, 23:9 extensive [2] - 5:3, 16:3 extensively [1] - 3:19 extent [4] - 4:21, 4:25, 39:1, 40:6

#### F

extremely [1] - 5:3

face [1] - 15:9 fact [2] - 9:10, 13:1 fair [2] - 6:5, 40:1 faith [1] - 16:25 fall [1] - 10:8 familiar [1] - 29:6 fantastic [1] - 27:20 fast [1] - 25:17 faster [4] - 12:7, 20:16, 24:19, 31:3 fastest [1] - 12:5 Federal [4] - 28:20, 30:17, 30:18, 30:19 few [2] - 13:14, 32:15 fifty [1] - 32:3 fight [2] - 16:2, 34:12 figure [2] - 7:21, 31:7 **file** [5] - 7:20, 8:7, 23:1, 36:9, 40:16 filed [7] - 7:18, 10:3, 14:16, 15:24, 16:10, 17:22, 22:7 files [1] - 33:1 filing [1] - 40:6 fine [1] - 36:3

Fire [2] - 1:18, 3:18 first [4] - 18:2, 18:14, 32:23, 36:21 five [3] - 10:21, 34:5, 37:10 Floor [1] - 1:18 Florham [1] - 2:9 Florida [1] - 30:22 follow [1] - 22:25 followed [1] - 22:22 football [1] - 29:18 FOOTBALL [2] - 1:5, 1:10 force [3] - 18:10, 18:13, 21:22 forget [1] - 13:1 form [1] - 11:10 **forum** [2] - 18:3, 18:12 forward [1] - 21:20 four [1] - 10:21 fourteen [1] - 16:19 frame [1] - 25:13 frames [1] - 29:5 Friday [1] - 11:1 front [1] - 4:14 fruitless [1] - 17:8

## G

full [1] - 11:20

general [2] - 32:18

Giants [8] - 5:6, 14:16, 23:13, 23:22, 24:24, 25:2, 25:18, 26:3

governed [2] - 24:17, 30:18

grant [1] - 22:17

granted [2] - 7:19, 22:8

granting [3] - 39:19, 39:23, 39:24

grants [1] - 14:20

great [2] - 32:22, 36:1

grouped [1] - 7:5

## Н

Hahn [2] - 2:25, 42:7
half [1] - 8:6
hand [1] - 29:23
handed [1] - 11:5
handful [1] - 16:19
happy [4] - 21:4,
33:10, 33:22, 40:16
harassment [2] 26:25, 27:3
hard [1] - 33:1
harm [7] - 8:10, 8:14,
13:2, 13:7, 16:11,
21:18, 39:20

heard [4] - 4:24, 13:10, 15:21, 21:19 hearing [1] - 11:25 **HEATHER** [1] - 1:20 Heather [1] - 3:21 help [3] - 16:14, 18:9, 27:23 **helps** [1] - 38:9 hiding [1] - 17:10 HIPA[2] - 33:18, 34:1 history [1] - 16:23 hold [1] - 22:2 **HOLINSTAT** [10] - 2:6, 14:8, 14:11, 29:22, 30:2, 35:22, 37:7, 37:18, 37:21, 41:10 Holinstat [1] - 3:10 home [1] - 21:3 Honor [99] - 3:14, 3:16, 3:19, 3:21, 4:1, 5:8, 6:22, 7:16, 7:18, 7:19, 7:24, 8:9, 8:22, 9:5, 9:9, 10:3, 10:5, 10:7, 10:16, 10:22, 11:2, 11:6, 11:14, 11:24, 12:2, 12:8, 12:13, 12:14, 13:12, 13:17, 13:19, 13:20, 14:14, 14:19, 14:21, 15:5, 15:9, 15:21, 16:5, 16:23, 18:14, 18:25, 19:6, 21:9, 21:15, 23:6, 23:7, 24:3, 24:10, 24:25, 25:14, 25:16, 26:21, 26:22, 27:6, 27:11, 27:12, 27:15, 27:22, 28:15, 28:16, 29:10, 29:22, 30:13, 31:1, 31:6, 31:9, 31:16, 32:8, 33:5, 33:10, 33:24, 33:25, 34:11, 34:20, 34:24, 35:13, 35:17, 36:8, 36:12, 36:23, 37:7, 37:18, 37:21, 37:25, 38:6, 38:14, 38:24, 39:7, 39:17, 39:18, 40:4, 40:9, 40:14, 41:9, 41:11, 41:23, 42:2 Honor's [2] - 23:5, 24:15 HONORABLE [1] -1:14 hopefully [2] - 9:11, 31:5

head [4] - 5:16, 26:17,

29:19, 29:21

17:6. 33:22

hear [4] - 8:9, 12:9,

hundred [1] - 32:2

idea [4] - 16:24, 18:15, 20:15, 37:22 identical [2] - 4:12, 26:13 immediately [2] -23:22, 33:13 implicate [1] - 14:25 implicates [2] - 15:6, 15:9 important [1] - 11:16 impose [2] - 21:8, 29:4 imposed [1] - 24:8 including [1] - 4:13 inconsistent [6] -5:13, 20:19, 21:13, 28:22, 29:17, 30:10 Index [2] - 1:3, 1:8 Indiana [5] - 21:21, 22:4, 22:6, 22:7, 22:13 individual [1] - 5:24 **information** [2] - 5:14, 5:23 injunction [3] - 27:13, 35:7, 36:9 injury [2] - 5:17, 26:17 instead [1] - 17:21 Insurance [3] - 3:2, 3:17, 3:18 insurance [11] - 16:20, 16:24, 17:3, 17:7, 17:21, 18:3, 20:6, 20:8, 21:6, 26:5 **INSURANCE** [1] - 1:2 insurance-related [1] - 16:20 insurer [1] - 3:20 insurers [13] - 3:20, 3:22, 4:4, 4:10, 7:11, 11:11, 14:16, 15:4, 15:16, 40:7, 40:16, 40:17, 40:22 intended [2] - 28:25, 29:9 intention [1] - 23:8 interested [1] - 31:2 interests [4] - 12:24, 13:8, 20:23, 24:6 interim [1] - 27:14

involve [1] - 14:15

involved [1] - 5:12

irreparable [7] - 8:10,

16:11, 21:18, 39:20

8:13. 13:2. 13:7.

iss [1] - 27:24

issue [10] - 4:4, 8:23, 8:24, 10:2, 10:3, 13:7, 15:23, 22:17, 23:17, 26:22 issued [2] - 4:17, 17:12 issues [15] - 5:1, 5:12, 5:14, 5:22, 8:24, 8:25, 17:13, 22:16, 23:8, 23:11, 23:21, 26:20, 29:6, 33:20,

#### J

34:6

Jersey [2] - 2:9, 30:5 **Jets** [3] - 29:22, 30:6, 30:7 job [1] - 23:1 Judge [16] - 4:14, 4:17, 9:1, 9:10, 9:12, 17:12, 17:17, 17:24, 23:14, 25:1, 25:22, 26:7, 28:10, 32:13, 35:24, 42:1 judgment [1] - 14:18 June [14] - 8:25, 12:10, 15:16, 35:19, 35:21, 36:3, 36:5, 36:16, 38:1, 38:22, 38:25, 40:5, 40:8, 40:13 jurisdiction [11] - 9:4, 9:19, 10:4, 10:6, 10:8, 19:8, 29:13, 30:5, 38:11, 39:5, 39:15 jurisdictions [6] -12:1, 12:12, 30:18, 34:8, 34:10, 38:17 Justice [1] - 1:14

#### Κ

Kansas [2] - 21:1, 21:3 KENNEDYS [1] - 1:17 kind [2] - 17:7, 18:4 knowledge [2] - 5:11, 23:9 knows [3] - 15:10, 16:6, 23:16

#### L

lag [1] - 41:21 large [1] - 27:4 last [3] - 8:2, 8:4, 16:4 late [2] - 10:23, 10:24 latest [1] - 8:3 mention [1] - 17:24

merits [1] - 21:20

might [3] - 5:25,

26:17, 27:21

million [1] - 37:10

minutes [1] - 42:5

Missouri [1] - 30:9

misspoke [1] - 18:25

MITCHELL [1] - 1:24

met [2] - 12:3, 16:24

15:18

mentioned [2] - 15:13,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

law [8] - 5:21, 8:13, 8:19, 10:10, 24:17, 24:18, 30:18 Law [1] - 11:10 laws [4] - 5:22, 11:18, 11:20, 20:22 **LEAGUE** [2] - 1:5, 1:10 least [1] - 21:17 legal [1] - 26:23 legitimate [1] - 18:11 **letter** [1] - 11:4 Lexington [1] - 1:18 liaison [1] - 3:19 light [1] - 17:19 lightly [2] - 8:7, 29:11 lines [1] - 25:15 list [3] - 32:19, 32:20, 33:15 litigating [1] - 31:2 litigation [3] - 23:6, **LLP** [3] - 1:22, 2:3, 2:8 location [1] - 32:24 lodged [2] - 14:6, 14:17 look [3] - 9:15, 26:10, 28:19 looked [1] - 3:24 looking [1] - 20:13 love [1] - 38:5

### M

mails [1] - 32:25 majority [1] - 32:13 make-up [1] - 36:25 management [1] -20:14 manner [1] - 15:12 MASLEY [1] - 1:14 matter [3] - 3:2, 15:14, 38:12 matters [1] - 13:19 maximal [1] - 37:1 MDL [1] - 15:8 mean [1] - 20:5 meaning [1] - 37:17 means [2] - 30:11, 32:2 meantime [1] - 17:12 mediation [1] - 4:18 meet [5] - 6:3, 16:4, 17:8, 17:16, 26:5 meet-and-confer [5] -6:3, 16:4, 17:8, 17:16, 26:5 membership [1] -15:10 Memo [1] - 11:10

Mitchell [2] - 3:13, 13:13 moment [1] - 7:8 months [11] - 8:3, 8:4, 10:14, 10:21, 11:22, 13:9, 13:10, 16:5, 16:9, 17:11, 32:9 morning [2] - 3:1, 3:16 most [1] - 15:1 motion [13] - 5:19, 6:24, 11:21, 13:15, 13:16, 13:19, 15:14, 18:20, 22:7, 22:17, 23:2, 28:24, 36:9 motions [11] - 7:17, 7:20, 8:7, 14:15, 14:16, 14:19, 14:24, 15:24, 16:10, 17:22 motivate [1] - 31:6 movant [2] - 3:8, 3:24 moving [1] - 12:1 MR [122] - 3:6, 3:9, 3:13, 3:16, 3:21, 4:1, 4:21, 6:9, 6:18, 6:22, 7:10, 7:13, 8:22, 9:9, 9:22, 10:2, 10:14, 10:25, 11:6, 11:9, 11:11, 12:20, 13:12, 14:1, 14:6, 14:8, 14:10, 14:11, 14:14, 15:21, 16:22, 18:8, 18:14, 18:24, 19:18, 19:21, 19:23, 20:3, 22:3, 22:6, 22:11, 22:14, 22:19, 22:24, 23:3, 24:3, 24:10, 24:25, 25:9, 25:11, 25:14, 25:21, 26:1, 26:4. 26:13. 26:15. 26:21, 27:6, 27:11, 27:20, 28:2, 28:4, 29:22, 30:2, 30:13, 31:16, 31:22, 32:8, 33:5, 33:9, 33:19, 33:21, 33:23, 34:2, 34:15, 34:20, 34:24, 35:2, 35:5, 35:9, 35:13, 35:17, 35:21,

35:22, 35:23, 36:1, 36:4, 36:5, 36:8, 36:12, 36:19, 36:22, 37:4, 37:7, 37:18, 37:21, 37:25, 38:5, 38:14, 38:20, 38:23, 39:7, 39:10, 39:13, 39:16, 39:17, 40:1, 40:4, 40:9, 40:14, 40:21, 40:25, 41:1, 41:3, 41:6, 41:9, 41:10, 41:11, 41:15, 41:23, 42:1, 42:2

MS [1] - 32:22

multiple [2] - 6:6, 6:8

#### N

**NATIONAL** [2] - 1:5, 1:10 nature [1] - 5:11 need [14] - 12:2, 12:4, 12:11, 27:8, 31:8, 31:10, 31:11, 32:23, 33:2, 33:24, 34:7, 34:10, 39:11, 39:14 needed [1] - 7:19 needing [1] - 9:3 negotiated [1] - 24:13 never [1] - 17:2 **NEW** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 New [20] - 1:11, 1:19, 2:5, 2:9, 4:13, 5:6, 5:7, 5:20, 5:21, 6:15, 8:19, 10:10, 12:14, 14:15, 21:2, 30:5, 30:21 next [2] - 33:6, 35:18 Next [1] - 1:25 NFL [25] - 1:22, 3:3, 3:13, 3:14, 4:2, 7:20, 8:23, 9:7, 9:25, 13:13, 14:22, 14:25, 15:6, 15:7, 15:9, 15:11, 19:17, 19:20, 20:7, 24:8, 36:9, 40:6, 40:14 NFL's [3] - 7:11, 9:7, 41:3 nice [1] - 31:24 non [1] - 15:25 non-privileged [1] -15:25 nonmember [1] -11:17 Nonparties [1] - 2:4 nonparties [11] - 4:20, 5:15, 6:5, 7:6, 17:18, 19:13, 20:23, 28:23, 32:7, 39:5, 41:13

nonparties' [1] - 9:17 nonparty [9] - 3:6, 3:7, 4:2, 11:18, 11:19, 18:23, 19:1, 23:22, 27:17 North [2] - 1:18, 3:18 note [1] - 11:16 nothing [4] - 8:6, 9:2, 21:25, 23:16 number [2] - 14:8, 14:12

# 0

object [2] - 23:2, 28:1 objection [3] - 9:20, 27:19, 37:16 objections [1] - 33:14 obligations [2] -28:22, 29:5 obviously [4] - 4:23, 11:6, 27:15, 32:24 October [1] - 11:15 odd [1] - 18:4 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:1 offer [1] - 37:9 offered [4] - 5:18, 5:19, 31:21, 37:12 offering [1] - 41:1 Ohio [4] - 8:12, 8:13, 24:17, 30:22 old [1] - 33:2 once [1] - 40:10 One [1] - 1:23 one [23] - 7:4, 7:5, 9:19, 10:22, 13:17, 14:2, 15:1, 15:5, 15:23, 17:25, 23:19, 26:16, 26:19, 28:9, 28:11, 29:23, 30:5, 32:18, 32:23, 37:1, 39:2, 40:5, 41:19 ones [1] - 19:25 oOo [1] - 2:14 op [6] - 26:2, 35:4, 36:13, 36:16, 40:11, 40:13 opinion [1] - 32:13 opportunity [4] -21:22, 21:24, 22:8, 34:17 opposed [1] - 38:2 **opposition** [3] - 11:2, 25:11, 34:23 Order [10] - 4:4, 4:17, 21:19, 21:21, 22:3, 22:8, 34:4, 34:11, 35:5, 41:17 order [4] - 5:18, 13:18, 15:24, 19:10

ordered [1] - 13:25 orders [1] - 15:3 organize [1] - 27:5 original [1] - 25:7 outcome [1] - 6:16 overlap [2] - 4:22, 4:25 own [1] - 11:18

P Page [1] - 1:25 page [3] - 13:25, 17:25, 28:11 paper [1] - 40:23 papers [9] - 3:24, 14:3, 14:7, 26:11, 34:18, 36:10, 39:11, 40:6, 40:7 parameters [2] - 4:19, 33.3 Park [1] - 2:9 part [8] - 9:1, 9:12, 23:11, 23:12, 23:13, 24:1, 28:6, 39:3 particular [4] - 26:16, 29:18, 32:20 particularly [1] - 28:19 parties [11] - 7:14, 8:18, 12:18, 12:19, 12:20, 13:4, 19:9, 19:11, 20:2, 28:21, 32:3 party [13] - 7:4, 8:15, 9:11, 14:22, 18:20, 18:21, 18:22, 19:1, 19:4, 19:5, 19:24, 29:1, 39:2 passage [1] - 10:22 past [1] - 32:11 pause [1] - 36:15 pay [1] - 5:25 pending [1] - 4:14 people [1] - 7:8 per [1] - 33:15 perfectly [2] - 18:11 period [3] - 17:10, 31:18, 38:21 person [4] - 18:24, 18:25, 19:4, 41:19 personal [1] - 5:23 perspective [3] -11:25, 24:4, 27:16 phone [1] - 17:23 picture [1] - 7:7 place [4] - 9:19, 17:2, 18:5. 20:20 Plaintiff [2] - 1:4, 1:8 plaintiff [2] - 3:5, 20:1 plaintiffs [3] - 20:1,

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

32:5, 33:14 player [3] - 5:14, 26:16, 26:18 player's [1] - 29:18 players [5] - 5:24, 32:15, 32:19, 32:20, 33.16 pleading [2] - 11:7, 11:8 plus [1] - 5:4 point [6] - 4:6, 4:14, 7:17, 9:24, 15:22, points [1] - 13:14 pose [1] - 21:10 position [5] - 5:8, 7:2, 9:7, 9:18, 30:15 possibility [1] - 28:21 possible [3] - 12:5, 29:3, 29:7 poster [1] - 28:23 power [1] - 29:13 practical [1] - 38:6 practice [1] - 11:21 prefaced [1] - 15:2 prejudice [2] - 19:4, 28:17 preliminary [4] - 6:24, 27:12, 35:7, 36:8 prepared [5] - 6:1, 12:8, 25:15, 29:2, present [1] - 18:16 preserves [1] - 15:12 presume [1] - 27:11 previously [1] - 31:19 privilege [15] - 5:2, 5:14, 7:2, 8:16, 8:23, 8:24, 13:5, 15:9, 15:12, 15:13, 15:14, 15:23, 33:18, 34:1, 37.22 privileged [4] - 15:25, 16:2, 29:24, 30:1 problem [3] - 22:14, 30:21, 37:14 problems [1] - 34:6 procedure [2] - 18:19, 22:24 Procedure [1] - 30:19 proceed [8] - 6:19, 12:6, 12:11, 12:22, 24:20, 33:10, 34:7, 34.9 proceeding [4] - 4:15, 24:19, 38:16, 39:1 Proceedings [1] proceedings [7] - 4:5, 4:10, 4:11, 5:12,

18:16, 20:9 Process [1] - 22:12 process [14] - 7:23, 8:1, 9:23, 10:15, 12:10, 12:23, 13:3, 15:18, 16:14, 17:8, 22:21, 24:13, 27:21, 39:22

processes [1] - 20:17 produce [24] - 13:4, 15:25, 16:1, 16:11, 16:17, 17:10, 17:15, 21:23, 27:18, 27:25, 30:6, 30:8, 30:23, 30:24, 31:7, 31:14, 33:6, 33:13, 34:5, 36:2, 37:15, 37:23, 38:1, 39:3 produceable [1] -

16:17 production [4] - 34:2, 37:4, 37:5, 37:10 productions [1] - 6:13 progress [1] - 32:10 proper [3] - 8:12, 10:4, 13:3 **properly** [1] - 9:4

**Properties** [3] - 1:22, 3:14, 13:13 **PROPERTY** [1] - 1:7 proposal [6] - 10:19, 10:20, 16:11, 25:8, 26:9, 28:7

**propose** [1] - 32:8

proposed [4] - 15:24, 25:23, 32:6, 32:12 **PROSKAUER** [1] - 2:3 Proskauer [6] - 3:9, 3:10, 7:14, 8:5, 8:10, 15:17

protect [2] - 20:23, 29:9 protected [1] - 5:23

provide [1] - 33:15 provision [1] - 18:18 punishing [2] - 9:6, 9:25

punishment [2] - 10:2, 21:9 purely [1] - 21:8

purposes [1] - 38:12 put [4] - 9:23, 26:2, 34:22, 35:3

Q

questions [1] - 24:16 quick [1] - 13:23 quicker [1] - 12:7 quickly [3] - 9:15,

12:1, 26:11 quote [2] - 11:16, 15:5

## R

raise [2] - 13:5, 13:6 raised [2] - 8:25, 26:22 rather [1] - 15:6 rational [2] - 6:19, 21.7 rationale [1] - 10:7 react [1] - 18:15 read [2] - 10:22, 11:3 reading [1] - 13:23 ready [1] - 21:5 reality [1] - 21:11 really [3] - 6:5, 19:7, 28:18 reason [6] - 7:19, 21:7, 29:4, 29:7, 41:21 reasonable [3] -18:12, 20:10, 21:11 reasons [1] - 15:17 recently [1] - 32:12 recommend [1] - 33:7 record [1] - 9:16 records [1] - 29:18 refer [2] - 13:19, 13:20 referee [2] - 4:18, 5:5 Referee [5] - 14:17, 14:21, 15:15, 23:7, 23:9 reference [3] - 15:22, 16:5, 41:16 referral [1] - 13:18 referred [3] - 14:7, 14:21, 26:24 refers [1] - 26:25 refile [1] - 11:7 refused [1] - 28:6 regard [1] - 9:8 regarding [2] - 15:7, 33:16 rejects [1] - 34:11 related [3] - 4:11, 5:24, 16:20 relevant [3] - 17:14, 23:10, 30:8 relief [2] - 14:20, 14:24 remains [1] - 16:2 remember [1] - 7:4 replies [1] - 25:12 reply [8] - 34:17, 35:1, 35:11, 36:14, 36:17, 40:5, 40:11, 40:13 report [1] - 27:15

Reporter [2] - 2:25,

42:8 represent [1] - 39:13 represented [2] - 8:5, 30.14 representing [1] - 4:2 represents [1] - 7:14 request [2] - 18:11, 25:4 requests [3] - 5:2, 15:1, 15:3 required [2] - 17:15, 20:25 reserve [1] - 17:5 reside [1] - 11:17 respect [8] - 5:1, 5:4, 19:13, 21:14, 25:17, 28:18, 29:10, 38:7 respectful [1] - 32:1 respond [8] - 8:11, 9:3, 16:22, 21:22, 21:24, 22:9, 40:7, 40:17 responded [1] - 40:14 response [2] - 11:9, 40:16 rest [1] - 34:3 restrain [1] - 18:16 restraining [1] - 19:9 restraints [1] - 6:24 restrictions [1] -20:11 result [1] - 15:15 review [2] - 37:17, 37:20 revisit [1] - 33:25 **rights** [1] - 19:13 rise [1] - 5:13 risk [1] - 29:16 River [2] - 1:18, 3:18 road [1] - 10:21 roll [1] - 37:19 rolling [5] - 37:9, 37:12, 37:15, 37:16, 38:2 **ROSE** [1] - 2:3 Rose [1] - 3:9 route [1] - 24:5 rule [2] - 23:15, 23:16 rules [1] - 11:18 ruling [2] - 9:1, 28:11 rulings [13] - 4:22, 4:23, 5:4, 17:13, 17:20, 18:5, 20:11, 20:16, 20:19, 21:2,

23:23, 29:3, 35:24

run [2] - 37:8, 40:9

save [1] - 35:25

SCHAFLER [43] - 2:5, 3:6, 3:9, 4:1, 4:21, 6:9, 6:18, 16:22, 18:8, 18:14, 18:24, 19:18, 19:21, 19:23, 20:3. 22:3. 22:6. 22:11, 22:14, 22:19, 22:24. 23:3. 25:14. 26:4, 26:13, 26:15, 28:2, 28:4, 31:16, 31:22, 33:9, 33:21, 35:13, 36:19, 36:22, 37:4, 38:14, 39:7, 39:10, 39:13, 39:16, 41:9, 41:15 Schafler [4] - 3:9, 3:25, 4:2, 32:11 schedule [5] - 6:2, 25:2, 25:5, 27:12, 36:10 **scheduled** [1] - 12:12 **scope** [3] - 5:2, 6:14, 20:12 search [17] - 6:4, 6:10, 6:11, 6:12, 16:8, 28:5, 28:10, 30:23, 30:24, 31:14, 32:6, 32:9, 32:12, 32:21, 36:18, 36:21, 37:22 searches [4] - 6:4, 6:6, 32:24, 37:8 seat [4] - 13:11, 23:20, 30:12 seated [1] - 3:1 second [2] - 14:2, 23:20 see [6] - 6:7, 24:1, 26:6, 27:16, 29:19, 37:14 seek [1] - 15:22 seeking [3] - 15:4, 33:17, 33:18 seeks [2] - 13:19, 15:25 select [1] - 18:12 send [2] - 14:4 Senior [2] - 2:25, 42:8 sense [6] - 5:9, 6:7, 13:16, 14:23, 19:6, 23:15 sensitive [1] - 5:14 separate [1] - 14:25 **separately** [1] - 32:19

series [1] - 7:17

serve [1] - 7:22

9:4, 11:1

9:23

served [4] - 8:3, 8:11,

serving [2] - 7:24,

set [3] - 11:25, 25:1,

S

\_\_\_\_\_

INDEX NO. 652933/2012

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019

07.40
27:12
<b>SETH</b> [1] - 2:5
Seth [2] - 3:9, 4:1
seven [6] - 10:16,
11:22, 35:13, 40:16,
40:22, 41:3
<b>shake</b> [1] - 29:19
shaking [1] - 29:21
<b>Shane</b> [1] - 40:4
<b>SHANE</b> [1] - 2:10
shared [2] - 29:23,
30:4
short [1] - 25:13
<b>Show</b> [4] - 4:4, 34:4,
34:11, 35:5
showing [2] - 19:2,
• • •
21:17
sides [1] - 34:17
sign [2] - 31:25, 38:19
signing [1] - 41:17
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
similar [1] - 26:12
<b>simple</b> [1] - 41:13
<b>simply</b> [4] - 9:3, 10:18,
17:1, 30:23
<b>SIMPSON</b> [10] - 1:20,
3:21, 15:21, 24:25,
25:9, 25:11, 32:8,
32:22, 35:21, 40:9
<b>Simpson</b> [2] - 3:21,
6:21
simultaneously [1] -
38:16
<b>single</b> [3] - 4:15,
15:23, 26:19
six [3] - 14:25, 17:11,
32:9
<b>sixty</b> [1] - 5:16
<b>slow</b> [2] - 10:15, 41:18
someone [1] - 29:19
sooner [2] - 12:7, 38:5
sophisticated [2] -
16:12, 16:13
sorry [3] - 19:18, 36:4,
36:5
sorts [1] - 15:3
sought [3] - 14:24,
16:7, 16:9
sounds [1] - 25:19
special [2] - 4:18,
22:23
Special [3] - 14:17,
14:21, 15:14
<b>specific</b> [7] - 28:8,
28:12, 32:14, 32:16,
32:18, 33:15, 33:16
spent [1] - 8:2
<b>Square</b> [1] - 2:4
stage [1] - 21:18
staggered [1] - 10:20
<b>stand</b> [6] - 8:9, 23:24,

29:20, 31:12, 33:8, 38:20 standing [1] - 34:8 start [4] - 3:23, 17:5, 27:20, 36:22 started [2] - 3:25, 7:16 **STATE** [1] - 1:1 **state** [9] - 5:22, 5:25, 7:3, 11:23, 11:24, 12:15, 20:16 States [1] - 3:17 states [9] - 4:7, 4:9, 7:15, 8:1, 11:17, 18:17, 20:10, 20:19, 23:25 statute [3] - 28:25, 29:8, 39:24 **statutes** [1] - 5:25 stay [5] - 4:5, 39:1, 39:3, 39:21, 41:19 stenographic [1] -42:5 **step** [3] - 32:18, 32:23, 33:4 **STEVEN** [1] - 2:6 Steven [1] - 3:10 still [1] - 30:14 stipulation [1] - 41:14 stop [3] - 14:2, 21:20, 23:19 strategy [1] - 15:8 Street [2] - 1:11, 1:23 subject [1] - 11:21 subjecting [1] - 28:21 submit [3] - 6:10, 6:15, 15:19 submitted [2] - 5:9, 24:25 **submitting** [1] - 10:23 subpoena [10] - 7:3, 8:11, 8:12, 9:3, 10:4, 10:6, 10:8, 12:16, 13:6, 24:17 subpoenas [10] - 4:12, 5:6, 7:22, 8:2, 12:22, 15:1, 24:24, 26:12, 32:25, 38:13 sufficient [2] - 21:17, 28:17 suggest [2] - 35:17, suggested [2] - 10:19, 25:16 suggests [1] - 10:10 Suite [1] - 2:9 supplemental [1] -32.20 **supporting** [1] - 36:9

**supportive** [1] - 13:15

**SUPREME** [1] - 1:1

suspect [1] - 12:21 symmetry [1] - 30:16 system [1] - 41:18

#### Т

table [2] - 3:4, 31:25 tag [1] - 13:24 Tal [2] - 2:25, 42:7 team [4] - 26:16, 32:15, 33:15, 36:23 teams [16] - 7:22, 7:25, 8:5, 9:2, 9:6, 11:15, 11:17, 16:18, 23:23, 27:18, 27:24, 30:4, 30:22, 32:14, 36:21, 37:2 technically [1] - 39:18 ten [3] - 35:9, 37:10, 37:17 tend [1] - 11:19 Tenth [1] - 1:23 terms [19] - 6:4, 6:10, 6:12, 16:8, 18:2, 28:5, 28:10, 30:16, 30:23, 30:24, 32:6, 32:9, 32:12, 32:21, 33:13, 36:18, 36:24, 37:6, 37:8 THE [105] - 1:1, 3:1, 3:8, 3:12, 3:15, 3:23, 4:16, 6:8, 6:17, 6:20, 7:7, 7:12, 8:20, 9:6, 9:13, 9:24, 10:11, 10:24, 11:4, 11:8, 11:10, 12:18, 13:10, 13:22, 14:2, 14:9, 14:13, 16:21, 18:7, 18:9, 18:22, 19:16, 19:19, 19:22, 19:24, 22:2, 22:5, 22:10, 22:12, 22:18, 22:21, 23:1, 23:19, 24:7, 24:23, 25:7, 25:10, 25:19, 25:24, 26:2, 26:10, 26:14, 27:2, 27:7, 27:17, 27:23, 28:3, 29:16, 29:25, 30:10, 31:11, 31:20, 31:23, 32:17, 33:12, 33:20, 34:1, 34:13, 34:16, 34:21, 34:25, 35:3, 35:7, 35:10, 35:14, 35:19, 35:25, 36:6, 36:11, 36:13, 36:16, 36:20, 37:3, 37:5, 37:14, 37:19, 38:4, 38:10, 38:18, 38:22, 38:25, 39:8, 39:12, 39:14, 39:23,

40:2, 40:12, 40:19, 40:24, 41:2, 41:5, 41:7, 41:12, 41:16, 41:24

third [1] - 9:11 third-party [1] - 9:11 thirty [19] - 4:2, 4:8, 7:5, 7:13, 7:25, 11:16, 14:25, 15:10, 16:18, 20:18, 21:23, 28:9, 31:12, 31:17, 33:7, 33:8, 33:25, 37:1

thirty-six [1] - 14:25 thirty-two [12] - 4:2, 4:8, 7:5, 7:13, 7:25, 11:16, 15:10, 16:18, 20:18, 28:9, 37:1 THOMAS [1] - 2:10 thousand [2] - 37:11,

37:17 three [2] - 32:2, 41:21 TIG [2] - 1:18, 3:17 today [3] - 4:3, 5:19, 14:3

together [2] - 7:21, 34:22 tolling [1] - 31:18

took [1] - 22:6 top [1] - 14:12 toto [1] - 15:4 track [1] - 25:17 transcript [2] - 41:17,

42:5

treat [2] - 32:3, 38:6 treating [1] - 22:23 trepidation [1] - 28:15 tried [1] - 8:4 TRO [8] - 6:23, 27:9.

27:16, 35:2, 35:8, 38:19, 39:19, 40:3 **true** [2] - 17:1, 42:4 **try** [2] - 18:4, 29:5 **trying** [8] - 18:15,

18:16, 18:17, 20:9, 21:10, 21:11, 21:12, 29:11

twelve [1] - 4:6 twenty [4] - 4:8, 7:15, 7:25, 11:17

**twenty-two** [3] - 7:15, 7:25, 11:17 **two** [22] - 4:2, 4:8, 4:9, 4:13, 7:5, 7:13, 7:15, 7:25, 8:18, 11:16,

11:17, 14:10, 14:14, 15:10, 16:18, 20:18, 28:9, 37:1, 38:2, 41:21

**type** [2] - 28:24, 29:8

typical [1] - 27:1

## U

ue [1] - 27:24 ultimately [4] - 4:8, 4:24, 7:19, 34:11 under [8] - 7:2, 7:5. 8:12, 8:13, 8:19, 10:6, 18:19, 24:17 underlying [1] - 22:15 understood [2] -34:15, 34:20 United [1] - 3:17 unreasonable [2] -19:2, 29:4 unwieldy [1] - 27:4 **up** [7] - 6:21, 20:17, 26:8, 29:20, 32:19, 34:9, 36:25 **US** [2] - 1:18, 2:8

### V

varies [1] - 11:19 verbal [1] - 39:20 versus [1] - 37:10 vexatious [1] - 29:8 view [1] - 14:22 virtually [4] - 4:12, 8:6, 10:17, 26:13 voluntarily [1] - 24:20

## W

walked [1] - 9:15 wants [1] - 40:18 warrant [1] - 29:14 Washington [1] - 1:24 week [1] - 41:21 weekend [2] - 11:1, 11:13 weeks [1] - 38:2 whole [1] - 24:21 widely [1] - 11:19 withdraw [1] - 4:5 word [1] - 15:2 works [1] - 27:14 world [1] - 31:2 wrote [1] - 40:10

#### Υ

year [3] - 8:2, 8:4, 8:6 years [2] - 5:16, 10:16 yield [2] - 9:14, 15:3 YORK [2] - 1:1, 1:1 York [18] - 1:11, 1:19, 2:5, 4:13, 5:6, 5:7, 5:20, 5:21, 6:15, FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 06/07/2019 05:11 PM INDEX NO. 652933/2012

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 571

7

8:19, 10:10, 12:14, 14:15, 21:2, 30:21

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/07/2019